

REMARKS

In the first Office Action the Examiner took the position that Michaels et al showed the entire construction of claim 1 including the pairs of insulators that surrounded the pole teeth and to which the wiring base was connected in a fixed position. Applicant argued that this was not the case and the Examiner now apparently agrees and newly cites the Laurie patent as a showing of the use of insulating halves that could be employed with Michaels. But fails to suggest why one skilled in the art would make such a modification.

It is most respectfully submitted that only an Examiner would propose such a modification because each reference is complete in itself and the combination would only complicate the construction and defeat the intended purpose of each reference.

Figure 10 of Michaels clearly indicates there is no insulating bobbin. This has tabs that cooperate with the core for location and assembly. Thus if an insulating bobbin of two pieces were employed the wiring base would again be connected directly to the core and not to the nonexistent insulating two piece bobbin.

In addition in Laurie the wiring base is formed integrally with one bobbin half. Thus a separate locating position is unnecessary and would defeat the basic purpose of this reference. It is well established that those skilled in the art would not combine references in such a way that neither served its intended purpose.

The dependent claims all partake of this patentable difference and further recite features that require the Examiner to further stretch his combination. However, in view of the significant differences from the basic combination, it is not believed necessary to argue these other differences at this time.

In view of this favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182
Pacific Time